

SUMMARIES

The *Amida Sūtra* and the Stone Scriptures of Fang-shan

INAOKA, Seijun

In the *Senchakushū* (chapter thirteen, "The Nembutsu Plants Many Good Roots") and *Gyakushū seppō* (third week), Hōnen explains as follows. According to Lung-shu's *Passages concerning the Pure Land*, the *Amida Sūtra* carved in stone in Hsiang-yang was written by Ch'en Jen-ling of the Sui Dynasty. The characters were graceful and many people prized and enjoyed them. In this version, we find the words "By upholding the name, one's sins are extinguished. This is the karmic result of the virtue of many good roots" after the phrase "with single and undistracted mind." These 21 characters are missing in the text found today.

Among the stone scriptures of Fang-shan, we find three versions of the *Amida Sūtra*, carved in the T'ang, Ming and Ch'ing dynasties. They are:

Amida Sūtra Preached by the Buddha, with Incantation for Birth Appended

(one fascicle) no. 77

Translated by the Tripiṭaka Master Kumārajīva of the Yao Ch'in

Dynasty

Carved in the T'ang, Grotto 8

Amida Sūtra Preached by the Buddha (one fascicle) no. 1118 (sūtra carved in the Ming dynasty)

Translated by Kumārajīva of the Yao Ch'in Dynasty

Carved in the Ming, Grotto 6

Amida Sūtra Preached by the Buddha (one fascicle) outside the grotto

(on the side of the north pagoda)

Translated by Kumārajīva of the Yao Ch'in Dynasty

Carved in the Ch'ing, outside the grotto

The twenty-one characters in question are found in the Ming and Ch'ing versions. The

present study collates the vulgate edition of the *Amida Sūtra* with the three versions of the *Amida Sūtra* found among the stone scriptures of Fang-shan.

**Pure Land Buddhism of Hōnen and Dao Chao:
The Influence and Exaltation of the *An le ji* in Hōnen's *Senchakushū* and
Sermons**

SATŌ, Ken

The purpose of this paper is to elucidate the influence and the role of Dao Chao 道綽 on Hōnen's 法然 Pure Land Buddhism. In his *Senchakushū* 選択集, Hōnen defines his position as "relying solely on Shan Dao 偏依善導一師." From this statement, the place of Dao Chao in Hōnen's thought becomes clear. Hōnen only cites Dao Chao's *An le ji* 安樂集 twice in the *Senchakushū*: in the chapter on "The Doctrine of Two Gateways, the Holy Path and the Pure Land 聖浄二門説" and in the chapter on "The Benefits of Nembutsu at its Beginning and End 念仏の始終両益." Hōnen cites the works of Shan Dao for the most part with respect to his other important doctrine such as "faith 安心" and "practice 起行."

Hōnen's did not necessarily accept Shan Dao's doctrine objectively. He accepted it subjectively based on his experience and created something unique to himself. So it is undeniable from the perspective of an outsider that his interpretation is somewhat biased. Hōnen relies wholly on Shan Dao only insofar as the latter understands the recitative nembutsu to the principle right cause for birth in the Pure Land. According to Shan Dao, everyone, whether good or evil, can be born in the Pure Land through the nembutsu, because the nembutsu is based on Amida Buddha's Original Vow. It is for this reason that the "sole practice of the nembutsu 専修念仏" becomes possible.

Dao Chao's importance lies in the fact that he explained the relationship of the nembutsu of the Original Vow to other Buddhist doctrines. Hōnen developed a new interpretation of the nembutsu that differs from that of his predecessors. To define his new interpretation, Hōnen employed Dao Chao's "classification of two gateways, the holy path and the Pure Land 聖道浄土二門判" because it was the most suitable

"critical classification of doctrine 教判." For the reasons stated above, I consider Dao Chao and Shan Dao to be inseparable.

My study is divided into the following sections.

1. The Buddhism in which the Time corresponds with One's Capacity
2. The Use of "the two gateways, the holy path and the Pure Land" in Chapter One of the *Senchakushū*
3. "The two gateways, the holy path and the Pure Land" in the *Ōjōtaiyōshō* 往生大要抄
4. The "triple choice" and "eight kinds of choice" in Chapter Sixteen of the *Senchakushū*
5. The Independence of the Jōdoshū
6. On the Reason why "the nembutsu alone will remain" in Chapter Six of the *Senchakushū*
7. The Benefits of the nembutsu at its beginning and end
8. Relying solely on Shan Dao

The *Kuan ching shu* and *Senchakushū*

TAKAHASHI, Kōji

Hōnen (1212-1133) founded the Jōdoshū in 1175 when he encountered Shan-tao's (613-681) *Kuan ching shu* (Chapter on Non-meditative Good). Ever since then, Hōnen declared that he "relies wholly on one master, Shan-tao," and maintained this position without change. When he lectured on the three Pure Land sūtras, he stated that "I will set forth my foolish thoughts relying primarily on Shan-tao and secondarily on the other masters," and sought to interpret the sūtras on the basis of Shan-tao. He thereby refused to engage in groundless exegesis.

Thus it goes without saying that when Hōnen compiled his major work, the *Senchakushū*, he based himself on the *Kuan ching shu*, one of Shan-tao's works (the so-called "five works in nine fascicles"). It can be said that without the *Kuan ching shu*,

Japanese Pure Land Buddhism could not have arisen at all. This holds true, not only of the Jōdoshū, but also of Shōkū's (1177-1247) Seizan Jōdoshū and Shinran's (1173-1262) Jōdo Shinshū. In this paper, I discussed the relation between the *Kuan ching shu* and *Senchakushū*.

Two Problems of St. Hōnen's Pure Land Buddhism

SAITŌ, Takanobu

In my paper, I treat two problems: the problem of grammar, and the problem of *genki ōjō*. First, how we should deal with the Japanese *kundoku* reading and modern Japanese translations of St. Hōnen's own commentaries and quotations in the *Senchakushū*? Should we consider St. Hōnen own words in the *Senchakushū* as Chinese or should we understand it as *kundoku* Japanese? Concerning the quotations, I primarily examine quotations from Shan-tao's works from the standpoint of grammar.

Additionally, I examine the problem of *genki ōjō*. I have discussed this topic in an earlier paper, where I noted that Shan-tao of the Tang Dynasty was the first Chinese Pure Land monk to use this term. I will discuss this problem in greater detail, and consider the reason why St. Hōnen did not accept the use of the term *genki ōjō*.

On the Daitokuji Version of the *Shūi Kango Tōroku*

NAKANO, Masaaki

The Daitokuji version of the *Shūi Kango Tōroku* was first introduced in "About the Newly Discovered Daitokuji Version of the *Shūi Kango Tōroku* (Gleanings of Hōnen's Sermons and Writings in Classical Chinese), "an article published in *Jōdo Shūgaku Kenkyū*, volume 22, by Noboru Kajimura and Toshihiro Soda in 1996. This paper further investigates this text, which is in the possession of Minakuchi-chōritsu library in Koga, Shiga.

Although the existence of the *Kango Tōroku*, *Wago Tōroku* and the *Shūi Wago Tōroku* among the *Kurodani Shōnin Gotōroku* documents could be traced back to medieval times, in my previous book (*The Fundamental Research on Hōnen's Writings*, Hōzōkan, 1994), I questioned the existence of the *Shūi Kango Tōroku* because the only version that existed was the edition revised by Ryōshō Gizan revised in the Edo period.

Therefore, this paper confirms the book style and the circumstances of the introduction of this text, and, in order to study the historical characteristics of the Daitokuji version of the book as a document, compares it with the Shōtoku version of the *Shūi Kango Tōroku*, *Daigobon*, *Saihō Shinanshō* and other texts.

As a result, it has become evident that there is a high possibility that the Daitokuji version existed the medieval times preceding the Shōtoku version. In short, this paper reexamines the text's status and proves its importance in determining the historical value of *Kurodani Shōnin Gotōroku*.

Studies on Hōnen's Writings in Japanese:

The Nishi Honganji Manuscript of the *Ōjō yōgishō, narabi ni Jūni Mondō, Zenshōbō Kyōke Innenshū*

Itō, Masahiro

The present work is a study of the *Ōjō yōgishō, narabi ni Jūni Mondō, Zenshōbō Kyōke Innenshū* (The Collection of Stories relating to the Essentials of Birth, the Twelve Questions and Answers, and the Proselytizing Efforts of Zenshōbō), a text written by Hōnen and copied in 1460 by the monk Jōnin. Currently held by Nishi Honganji, this work was known only from an article in the *Kosha Koban Shinshū Shōgyō Genson Mokuroku* (Catalogue of Extant Manuscripts and Woodblock Editions of Shin Buddhist Scriptures Works) 古写古版真宗聖教現存目録. Since there has been no complete study of this work, its contents remained a mystery. The only text available to scholars has been a manuscript copy held by Ōtani University.

With to the cooperation of the administrators of Nishi Honganji and the efforts of the Comprehensive Research Institute at Bukkyō University, a copy of the entire text

has now been preserved on microfilm. This means that a new manuscript from the early writings of Hōnen has now available for scholarly research. This is the first report on its contents.

Philologically speaking, we have little to add to the contents of the article on this work found in the *Kosha Koban Shinshū Shōgyō Genson Mokuroku*. This work was not extracted from the *Wago Tōroku* and transmitted as a separate text. Although it is difficult to determine its relationship to that the *Wago Tōroku*, since its compiler Ryoe does mention the *Ōjō yōgishō* in that work and also uses, probably for the first time, the category of the "Twelve Questions and Answers" as well, the possibility of this text being directly influenced by the *Wago Tōroku* is quite high.

On the last line of the eighteenth and last leaf, the date of the manuscript copy is noted along with the phrase, "Respectfully copied by Jōnin, in permanent residence at Zenpukuji in Azabu." An old temple, this Zenpukuji was founded by Kūkai, who is said to have referred to it as the Mount Azabu in the east, in contrast to the Mount Koya in the west. When Shinran was returning from Jōriku to Kyoto, he stayed there for some time, and it is thought that this resulted in the temple converting to Shinshū. It is therefore not insignificant that this temple is now affiliated with the Nishi Honganji branch of Shinshū, and the text itself coming to be housed in the Nishi Honganji collection.

The work itself is written in *kanbun* (Chinese syntax) form, but with *okurigana* and at times even some *furigana*. However, it is believed that the original work was written in *wabun* (Japanese syntax). If so, it is an example of a text linked with the *Wago Tōroku* collection that was intentionally rewritten as *kanbun*. In this connection, several points must be kept in mind concerning the manuscript and xylograph transmission of the *Wago Tōroku* itself. (A) The original *Wago Tōroku* was deeply influenced by Chinese syntax, with the *okurigana* incorporated into the text itself. Thus we should recognize the existence of a *katakana* lineage of *Wago Tōroku*, from which came the two lines of text, the Genko period recension and the Kanei period recension. (B) The Genkō period printing of the *Wago Tōroku* should be considered to reflect the original form of the text. The later Kanei period printed edition as well as manuscript copies all derive from this text. (C) Without hazarding a guess as to what Ryōe's original text looked like, we can confirm that based upon it and in relatively close proximity to it in

time, there were versions of the *Wago Tōroku* in *kanbun*, *katakana* and *hiragana* that became lineages in their own right.

Originally, only the *hiragana* form of the *Wago Tōroku* as reflected in the Genkō period printed edition was accepted as genuine. However, as the existence of the *katakana* Kanei period edition suggests, there also existed another, earlier lineage of manuscript editions written in this form. The fact that the present work copied by Jōnin is in *kanbun* with some *katakana* rather than the *hiragana* form seen in the Genkō edition is therefore very suggestive for this debate over the evolution of the *Wago Tōroku* as a whole.

In this study, we have transcribed the text, adding our thoughts in regards to difficult passages. In comparing this work to Hōnen's other early *wabun* writings, we have found a number of unusual characters whose appearance in a variety of sentences we do not believe are the product of mere scribal errors or intentional emendations. We expect this information will play a prominent role in later efforts to sort out the transmission lineages of Hōnen's *wabun* writings and in the effort to clarify the original text of the *Wago Tōroku*.

Regarding the text called the *Jūni Mondō* included here, it is well known that there are many other versions of this text. On the problem of the identity of the interlocutor (who has been alternatively identified as Zenshōbō, Ryūkan, "someone," or unspecified), we have looked at the implications of the meaning of the term "*shingyō shū*" that appears in the title here ("*Shingyō Shū Jūni Mondō*").

Whatever the merits of our research, it is a cause for celebration in Hōnen studies whenever a previously unknown work is uncovered. If this leads to some small contribution toward clarifying the form of his original writings, it will bring unexpected joy to all of us.

The Reception and Development of Genshin's Buddhist Philosophy in Hōnen

FUKUHARA, Ryūzen

It is said that Hōnen (1133-1212), who was converted to Pure Land Buddhism upon

reading the *Ōjōyōshū* written by Genshin (942-1017), later founded the Pure Land sect based on Shan-tao's (613-681) nembutsu of the Original Vow. But in expressing his teachings, Hōnen was influenced by Genshin in many ways. In this study, I consider Genshin's influenced found in Hōnen's sermons.

I first collected quotations from Genshin or Genshin's writings in Hōnen's sermons. They can be classified into the following categories: (1) passages on the nembutsu or passages promoting the nembutsu, (2) the relation of the nembutsu and various practices, (3) merits of the nembutsu and Name, (4) merits of Amida's life, (5) merits of Amida's light, (6) Amida's person and surroundings, (7) supplements to Shan-tao's teachings, (8) mixed practices and various practices, (9) sūtras and treatises that propagate birth, (10) the three minds, (11) the Pure Land, (12) nembutsu for special occasions, (13) nembutsu in ordinary life and at the moment of death, (14) characteristics of the nembutsu practitioner, (15) the sixteen contemplations, (16) the three acts of merit and the nine grades of birth, (16) Tendai Buddhism. Among them, passages dealing with (1) to (5) are especially numerous, especially in comparison with those from (6) on. Both in the number of quotations and in terms of content, they have exerted a strong influence on Hōnen.

Hōnen begins from the position that "people who make use of Eshin (i. e., Genshin) must necessarily go back to Shan-tao" (commentary on the *Ōjōyōshū*), to his position of "relying primarily on Shan-tao and secondarily on the other masters" (commentary on the Triple Sūtras) and finally to that of "relying wholly on Shan-tao" (*Senchakushū*). In this way, Hōnen gradually comes to rely wholly on Shan-tao, but in his writings, Hōnen cites other masters, especially Genshin, in various places. Hence, we can see that Genshin was quite influential. This may be due to the fact that Hōnen "entered the Pure Land Dharma-gate through the *Ōjōyōshū*" and hence the *Ōjōyōshū* exerted a great influence on Hōnen. Hōnen quotes Genshin in various ways, but the former may have gotten the hint for explaining the relationship between the entrance and the innermost point of faith, from Genshin's analysis of the relationship between the nembutsu and various practices. Hōnen's teaching for the salvation of all people is based on the notion that one should not seek sudden change, and that in spreading the teaching of the nembutsu of the Original Vow, one must proceed with reformation gradually. The form this takes can be found in Genshin.

**The Issue of Birth in Ippen's Pure Land Thought:
As the Development of that of Hōnen**

TAKEUCHI, Akira

Ippen was the disciple's disciple, of Shōkū, who was himself Hōnen's foremost disciple. Hence Ippen's teaching, even as it represented his own unique understanding, was based on that of Hōnen as transmitted by Shōkū, and also had possessed the original characteristic.

Traditionally, Pure Land Buddhism taught the possibility of birth and life in Amida Buddha's Pure Land after death. This is because it is difficult for the common man to manifest his own Buddha-nature by himself. Therefore in his *Senchakushū* Hōnen declared that it is possible to be born in the Pure Land after death by chanting the name of Amida Buddha.

However, even while Hōnen understood the birth in the Pure Land to be something achieved after death, he often declared that the devotees chanting the name set their hearts in the Pure Land and he lived himself already there in his present life. Therefore Hōnen also said "Chant the name earnestly believing that it will result in birth in the Pure Land."

On the other hand, although Ippen, following traditional Pure Land thought, unquestionably understood the birth in the Pure Land to be something achieved after death, he considered that, because every moment was last moment, there is no difference between being born in the Pure Land after one's death and being born there in one's hearts at present.

Indeed for Ippen, being born in the Pure Land was the death of the self by chanting the name, and the death of the self meant becoming Amida Buddha. This is the unity between the person chanting the name and Amida Buddha. Neither Hōnen nor Shōkū required a person to rely on his own efforts; they only stressed the need to rely on the compassion of the Buddha. Moreover Ippen excepted faith from the necessary conditions of being born in the Pure Land in order to push the logic of the *selection* forward. Of course, it depended on the chanting the name of the Buddha. Therefore Kandō, a Tokugawa period Jishū monk who learned the *Senchakushū*, argued in his

Senchaku-kikyūshō that the faith was present in the chanting of the name.

In short, the Pure Land Buddhism returned to main-current of Mahāyāna Buddhism in Ippen's Pure Land thought. Thus, the difference between Pure Land Buddhism and Holy Path Buddhism disappeared in Ippen's Pure Land thought.

A Review of Maruyama's "Study of Kamakura Buddhism": The Case of Hōnen's Pure Land Buddhism

KATŌ, Shinkō

Chapter 1 consists of the thoughts and doctrines of Shinran, Dōgen, and Nichiren in the Kamakura Period, of the activities and thoughts of Hōnen, and of a comparison of Hōnen, Shinran, Dōgen, and Nichiren who were considered the outstanding great thinkers in the world at that time.

Chapters 2 and 3 deal the matter of Buddhist groups and organizations.

Chapter 2 explains that Nichiren was actively included in politics, but Hōnen was not. Nevertheless the group of Hōnen was persecuted by secular and religious powers many times and was pulled into the political system.

Chapter 3 explains two sets of variables and the AGIL diagram introduced by Parsons, as modified by Bellah.

Chapter 4 makes it clear that Ohno mentions an idea about the transition from the late Heian Period to the Kamakura Period. He emphasizes religious teachings. Maruyama's explanation of Buddhism owes something to him.

Chapter 5 synchronizes the new Buddhist argument with the Bushi argument in the Kamakura Period. The structure and activities of the Bushi group were codified by the *Jōeishikimoku*.

Maruyama's approach suggests that the most important factors in the study of religion are doctrine and organization. In this, it differs from that of Durkheim, for whom ritual is also important.